

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-0260/158416.02
Application No.: 09/836,524
Office Action Dated: February 2, 2005

PATENT

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated February 2, 2005, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration based on the following remarks. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance.

Claims 1-23 are pending. Claims 1-23 have been rejected. Claims 1, 7, 13 and 21 are independent claims from which claims 2-6, 8-12, 14-20 and 22-23 respectively depend.

Applicant wishes to advise the Examiner that U.S. Patent Applications Numbers 09/894,519 filed June 28, 2001, 09/836,524 filed April 17, 2001, 09/837,904 filed April 19, 2001 and 09/839,784 filed April 20, 2001 are pending. The specifications of some of these applications share substantially identical portions, or include overlapping material. Moreover, some of the applications have overlapping sets of inventors.

Confirmation of Acceptance of Formal Drawings

Applicant respectfully requests confirmation that formal drawings filed by Applicant on April 17, 2001 have been accepted.

§102(e) Rejections

Claims 1-10, 12-13 and 19-20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Reed et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,088,717). It is respectfully submitted that these claims are patentable because Reed does not disclose or suggest all the features recited by Applicant's claims. For example, Applicant's claim 1, from which claims 2-5 depend, recites:

A method of facilitating commerce over a communications network comprising:

generating data indicative of a web site;

generating a signature of said data using a private key;

providing said data and said signature to a plurality of computing devices;

providing to said plurality of computing devices a public key corresponding to said private key; and

providing to said plurality of computing devices a set of computer-executable instructions which performs acts comprising:

determining the authenticity of said data against said signature; and

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-0260/158416.02
Application No.: 09/836,524
Office Action Dated: February 2, 2005

PATENT

displaying a link to said web site upon a determination that said data is authentic.

(emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that Reed does not disclose or suggest at least the italicized features of Applicants' claim 1.

Reed is directed to an automated communications system that can transfer data, metadata and instructions between databases from a provider computer to a consumer computer via a communications network to control and process communications and is directed to solving problems associated with dissemination of information about products and services of a company to consumers. In particular, Reed is concerned with finding ways to enable a consumer to easily receive the information the consumer wants when he wants it, to enable a consumer to find the information readily and to avoid sending the consumer information that the consumer does not want to receive. Reed is not directed to providing control over the information received by a consumer by authenticating data associated with websites so that a link to a website is only displayed if the website data is authenticated, as recited in Applicants' claim 1.

While Reed does describe encryption and authentication using public keys, private keys and digital signatures, encryption is used for secure transmission of messages (see, for example, columns 50-52). Reed's authentication service objects are used for "creating secure communications channels between providers and consumer." (column 107, line 64) not for determining whether a website link should be displayed, as recited in Applicants' claim 1.

Applicants' independent claims 7, 13 and 21 include analogous features. Hence Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the 102 rejections of claims 1-10, 12-13 and 19-20.

§103(a) Rejections

Claim 11 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reed in view of McFadzean et al. (U.S. Publ. No. US 2001/037302). Applicants respectfully submit that claim 11 is allowable as depending from allowable claim 7 because neither Reed nor McFadzean, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest at least "*an authentication module which verifies the authenticity of data against said signature and provides an*

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-0260/158416.02
Application No.: 09/836,524
Office Action Dated: February 2, 2005

PATENT

indication of whether said data is authentic; and a shopping module which receives said indication and which conditionally displays a link to said web site according to said indication". McFadzean does not cure the deficiencies of Reed, (described above). McFadzean is directed to locating and accessing information resources in a distributed information network. In response to receiving an HTTP request from a client, an ID authority server returns a URL of an ID registry server corresponding to a profile associated with the client. The client sends a query based on a domain name it receives from the ID authority server to the ID registry server. The ID registry server returns the URL of an appropriate ID host server. Hence, as neither Reed nor MacFadzean disclose or suggest at least "*an authentication module which verifies the authenticity of data against said signature and provides an indication of whether said data is authentic; and a shopping module which receives said indication and which conditionally displays a link to said web site according to said indication*", Applicants respectfully submit that claim 11 is allowable and request the withdrawal of the 103 rejection of claim 11.

Claims 14-18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reed in view of Fransdonk (U.S. Publ No. US 2003/0165241). Applicants respectfully submit that claims 14-18 are allowable as depending from allowable claim 13 because neither Reed nor McFadzean, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest at least "*limiting access to said web sites by performing acts which include: generating signatures for one or more of the web sites on said list using a key; and restricting access to said key; wherein said computer-executable instructions include instructions which authenticate said signatures and which deny access to a web site on said list whose signature fails to authenticate.*" Fransdonk does not cure the deficiencies of Reed, (described above). Fransdonk is directed to signing a content license required to access content and to distributing content in a geographically controlled fashion. The delivery system releases the content for delivery to the requestor provided that the content location complies with geographic access criteria. Hence, as neither Reed nor Fransdonk disclose or suggest at least "*limiting access to said web sites by performing acts which include: generating signatures for one or more of the web sites on said list using a key; and restricting access to said key; wherein said computer-executable instructions include instructions which authenticate said signatures and which deny access to a web site on said list whose signature fails to authenticate*", Applicants respectfully submit

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-0260/158416.02
Application No.: 09/836,524
Office Action Dated: February 2, 2005

PATENT

that claims 14-18 are allowable and request the withdrawal of the 103 rejections of these claims.

Claims 21-22 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perkowski (U.S. Patent No. 6,064,979) in view of Reed. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 21-22 are allowable because neither Perkowski nor Reed, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest at least "*accessing a list which includes a plurality of web sites, each of said web sites having a corresponding signature; determining the authenticity of each web site on said list against its corresponding signature; including in said data structure a first set of said web sites which are determined to be authentic against their respective signatures; and excluding from said data structure a second set of said web sites which fail to authenticate against their respective signatures.*" Perkowsi is directed to finding and serving consumer product-related information on the Internet. A database serving subsystem stores manufacturer identification numbers (MINs) assigned to product manufacturers. The client sends a request for information about a product identified by a universal product number (UPN). The database serving subsystem compares the UPN against the MINs and returns one or more URLs symbolically linked to the UPN. If there are no linked URLs, the homepage of the manufacturer's website is returned.

Reed, as described above is directed to an automated communications system that can transfer data, metadata and instructions between databases from a provider computer to a consumer computer via a communications network to control and process communications and is directed to solving problems associated with dissemination of information about products and services of a company to consumers. Hence, as neither Perkowsi nor Reed disclose or suggest at least the italicized features listed above, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 21-22 are allowable and request the withdrawal of the 103 rejections of these claims.

Claim 23 has been rejected as being unpatentable over Perkowski in view of Reed and further in view of McFadzean. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 23 is allowable because it depends from allowable claim 21, for the reasons described above. Neither Perkowski nor Reed nor McFadzean alone or in combination disclose or suggest all the features of allowable claim 21 from which claim 23 depends. McFadzean is directed to locating and accessing information resources in a distributed information network. In

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-0260/158416.02
Application No.: 09/836,524
Office Action Dated: February 2, 2005

PATENT

response to receiving an HTTP request from a client, an ID authority server returns a URL of an ID registry server corresponding to a profile associated with the client. The client sends a query based on a domain name it receives from the ID authority server to the ID registry server. The ID registry server returns the URL of an appropriate ID host server. Hence, McFadzean does not cure the deficiencies of Perkowski and Reed as described above with respect to claim 21. Hence, as neither Perkowski nor Reed nor McFadzean disclose or suggest at least the italicized features listed above, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 23 is allowable and request the withdrawal of the 103 rejections of claim 23.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the present Application is in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the rejections of the claims and an early allowance is earnestly solicited.

Date: May 2, 2005

Susan C Murphy
Susan C. Murphy
Registration No. 46,221

Woodcock Washburn LLP
One Liberty Place - 46th Floor
Philadelphia PA 19103
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439